

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Monitoring prevalence and persistence of environmental contamination by SARS-CoV-2 RNA in a makeshift hospital for asymptomatic and very mild COVID-19 patients

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Dewi Susanna

Submitted on: 13 Apr 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605994

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

This research has a high scientific effect, since there is only a few experiment concerning the measuring of SARS-CoV-2 virus in environment. I thought his informations are looked for scientists, researchers, and any stakeholder for decision making.

I have several notes as follow:

1. Why the authors did not use the terminology of COVID-19, therefore, the authors advised to discuss the relationship between SARS-CoV-2 and coronavirus caused COVID-19.
2. I could not see analysis of spatial in this manuscript as mentioned in the title.
3. The conclusion is not there, I thought there are recommendations.
4. Any notes can be found in text with special marked (please see the enclosed file).

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

This research has a high scientific effect, since there is only a few experiment concerning the measuring of SARS-CoV-2 virus in environment. I thought his informations are looked for scientists, researchers, and any stakeholder for decision making.

Unfortunately, the authors did not discuss about the relationship between SARS-CoV-2 and coronavirus caused COVID-19 and analysed the spatial term in this manuscript as mentioned in the title.

Any notes are given directly in the manuscript text.

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

General comments:

1. Event hough the author did not calculate the minimum samples, I thought the samples are sufficient for all variables.
2. The statistic test used was appropriate, but it must be mentioned which one the test used. Is it X2 test or Fisher's exact test.
3. The result about Ct test is not mentioned as one of the objectives, but it is presented in the results and discussed it.
4. What does spatial mean in this research? In general terminology, spatial means there is space and time.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Partly.

There is no explanation of spatial, since this term put in the title.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality



Q 10 Rigor



Q 11 Significance to the field



Q 12 Interest to a general audience



Q 13 Quality of the writing



Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study



REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.